

Searching for T, CP, CPT and $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ Rule Violations in the Neutral K Meson System - a Guide

M. Hayakawa [†] and A.I. Sanda [‡]

*Department of Physics, Nagoya University,
Nagoya 464-01, Japan*

February 1993

It is known that the existing experimental limit for CPT violation is rather poor; the 10 % level at best. The $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule is tested only up to 2 %. In this note, we discuss the possibility of measuring T, CP, CPT and $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule violations in the neutral K meson system. It is shown that not all the symmetry breaking parameters can be determined at a symmetric ϕ factory. Experiments with K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$ beams are needed to test all the symmetries.

Typeset Using *REVTEX*

[†]e-mail address:e43521a.nucc.cc.nagoya-u.ac.jp

[‡]e-mail address:sanda.phys.nagoya-u.ac.jp

I. INTRODUCTION

A clear understanding of CP violating mechanism is one of the few things missing in the standard model of electroweak interactions. It is hoped that progress along this direction will lead us to physics beyond the standard model. So far, the only observation of CP violation is in the $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ system. As we expect LEAR at CERN and the ϕ factory at Frascati [1] to provide further information on the K meson system, we feel that a systematic analysis to extract all available information is timely.

Once we admit that CP violation may be a clue to physics beyond the standard model, it is important to set up a program which enables us to study all possible symmetries, in particular CP , CPT , T and $\Delta S = \Delta Q$. Within the context of the standard model, only the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ current is allowed. The $\Delta S = -\Delta Q$ current induced by higher order electroweak corrections is very small [2]. Similarly, CPT violating effects are absent in the standard model of leptons and quarks. We do not expect this to change when the standard model is cast in terms of an effective theory of mesons and baryons.

We are not content with the existing experimental evidence for the validity of CPT and $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule. In Sec.II we present the experimental situation. Experimental limits to the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ violation in the neutral K meson system are obtained by measuring the amplitude ratio

$$x_l = \frac{A(\bar{K}^0 \rightarrow \pi^- l^+ \nu_l)}{A(K^0 \rightarrow \pi^- l^+ \nu_l)}, \quad (1)$$

for $l = e$ or μ . Current average values [3] are $\text{Re } x = 0.006 \pm 0.018$ and $\text{Im } x = -0.003 \pm 0.026$. We can also test $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule violation in the charged K meson system; the following ratio of widths [3]

$$\frac{\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^+ e^- \bar{\nu}_e)}{\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- e^+ \nu_e)} < 3 \times 10^{-4} \quad (2)$$

yields the upper bound to the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ violating process which is the same order as in the neutral K meson system, i.e. 2 %.

Existing experimental evidence for CPT conservation is rather poor. We see in Sec. II that the limit for the strength of CPT violating interaction is about 10 % of CP violating interaction. Also, on the theoretical side, the proof of the CPT theorem [4] makes a heavy use of the properties of asymptotic states. While it is difficult to construct reasonable CPT violating theories, this proof is obsolete, as quarks and gluons in QCD are not asymptotic states [5]. This proof should be reexamined.

We expect that future experiments will improve the accuracy of both measurements of CPT and $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule violations. So, at this exploratory stage, no assumption about the validity of these symmetries should be made. In this paper we outline a systematic procedure to study CP, T, CPT symmetry and $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule.

We first examine in Sec.III the possibility of measuring the violations of these symmetries at a ϕ factory. To our knowledge, a systematic study of $CP, T, CPT, \Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule at a ϕ factory is new. Similar attempts have been made by Tanner and Dalitz [6] for LEAR experiments; Some of our results also appear in Dunietz, Hauser and Rosner [7] who studied the possibility of measuring ϵ'/ϵ at a ϕ factory; Buchanan et.al. [8] discussed the possibility of testing CP and CPT symmetry at a ϕ factory assuming $\Delta S = \Delta Q$.

We show that separate measurements of Δ, x_l and $\bar{x}_l$, where these are CPT and $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ violating parameters defined below, cannot be made at a ϕ factory. Therefore, experiments with K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$ beam, such as LEAR experiments, are necessary for further determination of the parameters. Thus in Sec.IV we go on to discuss experiments with tagged kaon beam. Sec.V is devoted to discussion and conclusion.

II. NOTATIONS AND PREVIOUS EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we summarize the notations used throughout this paper, and make a few remarks concerning the existing experiments which test the CPT and $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule violations.

We consider the neutral K meson system which consists of two states $|K^0\rangle$ and $|\bar{K}^0\rangle$. These are eigenstates of strangeness S ; $S = 1$, and -1 for $|K^0\rangle$, and $|\bar{K}^0\rangle$, respectively. The time evolution of the arbitrary state $|\psi(t)\rangle = c_1(t)|K^0\rangle + c_2(t)|\bar{K}^0\rangle$ in this system is described by the equation [10]

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} c_1(t) \\ c_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = - \left(\frac{\Gamma}{2} + iM \right) \begin{pmatrix} c_1(t) \\ c_2(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where Γ and M are 2×2 matrices:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{12}^* & M_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{11} & \Gamma_{12} \\ \Gamma_{12}^* & \Gamma_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

In Appendix A we give the explicit expressions for the elements M_{ij} and Γ_{ij} which are valid up to H_W^2 , where H_W includes the electroweak interaction, as well as relations among matrix elements implied by various discrete symmetries. We can decompose the matrix $\frac{1}{2}\Gamma + iM$ as [9]

$$\frac{\Gamma}{2} + iM = D\mathbf{1} + i(E_1\sigma_1 + E_2\sigma_2 + E_3\sigma_3), \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the unit matrix and $\sigma_a (a = 1, 2, 3)$ are Pauli matrices;

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

The coefficients D and $E_a (a = 1, 2, 3)$ are then given by

$$\begin{aligned}
D &= \frac{1}{4} (\Gamma_{11} + \Gamma_{22}) + \frac{i}{2} (M_{11} + M_{22}) \\
E_1 &= \text{Re } M_{12} - \frac{i}{2} \text{Re } \Gamma_{12} \\
E_2 &= -\text{Im } M_{12} + \frac{i}{2} \text{Im } \Gamma_{12} \\
E_3 &= \frac{1}{2} (M_{11} - M_{22}) - \frac{i}{4} (\Gamma_{11} - \Gamma_{22}).
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

We express E_a ($a = 1, 2, 3$) in terms of complex polar parameters θ, ϕ and E [9]:

$$E_1 = E \sin \theta \cos \phi, \quad E_2 = E \sin \theta \sin \phi, \quad E_3 = E \cos \theta. \tag{8}$$

E is given by $E = \sqrt{E_1^2 + E_2^2 + E_3^2}$.

A. Mass eigenstates

The eigenvalues of the matrix $\frac{1}{2}\Gamma + iM$ are $\lambda_S = D + iE$ and $\lambda_L = D - iE$. If we denote the mass eigenstates $|K_S\rangle$ ($|K_L\rangle$) belonging to λ_S (λ_L) as:

$$\begin{aligned}
|K_S\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|p_1|^2 + |q_1|^2}} \left(p_1 |K^0\rangle + q_1 |\bar{K}^0\rangle \right), \\
|K_L\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|p_2|^2 + |q_2|^2}} \left(p_2 |K^0\rangle - q_2 |\bar{K}^0\rangle \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

then we have

$$\frac{q_1}{p_1} = \tan \frac{\theta}{2} e^{i\phi}, \quad \frac{q_2}{p_2} = \cot \frac{\theta}{2} e^{i\phi}. \tag{10}$$

B. 2π decays

The amplitudes associated with the 2π decay modes are needed in the succeeding section.

The parameters directly measured in the experiments are

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_{00} &= \frac{\langle \pi^0 \pi^0 | T | K_L \rangle}{\langle \pi^0 \pi^0 | T | K_S \rangle} = |\eta_{00}| e^{i\phi_{00}}, \\
\eta_{+-} &= \frac{\langle \pi^+ \pi^- | T | K_L \rangle}{\langle \pi^+ \pi^- | T | K_S \rangle} = |\eta_{+-}| e^{i\phi_{+-}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Using the isospin eigenstates $|(2\pi)_I\rangle$ ($I = 0, 2$)

$$\begin{aligned}\langle (2\pi)_I^{out} | T | K^0 \rangle &= A_I e^{i\delta_I}, \\ \langle (2\pi)_I^{out} | T | \bar{K}^0 \rangle &= \bar{A}_I e^{i\delta_I} \quad (I = 0, 2),\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

where $e^{2i\delta_I} \equiv \langle (2\pi)_I^{out} | (2\pi)_I^{in} \rangle$ defines the phase shift associated with the strong interaction.

If one decomposes η_{00} and η_{+-} as

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{+-} &= \epsilon + \epsilon', \\ \eta_{00} &= \epsilon - 2\epsilon',\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

we show in Appendix B that

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{q_2 \bar{A}_0}{p_2 A_0} \right), \\ \epsilon' &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \left[-\omega \left(1 - \frac{q_2 \bar{A}_0}{p_2 A_0} \right) + \left(\frac{p_2 A_2 - q_2 \bar{A}_2}{p_2 A_0} \right) \right],\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

where

$$\omega \equiv \frac{\text{Re } A_2}{\text{Re } A_0}.\tag{15}$$

C. Phase convention

As stated before, $|K^0\rangle$ and $|\bar{K}^0\rangle$ are eigenstates of strangeness. Since the strangeness quantum number is conserved by strong interaction, their relative phase can never be measured. So, all observables are independent of the phase transformation

$$\begin{aligned}|K^0\rangle &\rightarrow |K^0\rangle' = e^{i\alpha} |K^0\rangle, \\ |\bar{K}^0\rangle &\rightarrow |\bar{K}^0\rangle' = e^{-i\alpha} |\bar{K}^0\rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

In general, C and T transformations are defined only up to a phase:

$$\begin{aligned}C |K^0\rangle &= e^{i\phi_C} |\bar{K}^0\rangle, \\ T |K^0\rangle &= e^{i\phi_T} |K^0\rangle, \quad T |\bar{K}^0\rangle = e^{i\phi_T} |\bar{K}^0\rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

When the phase tranformation (16) is made, we can adjust ϕ_C and ϕ_T so that, for example,

$$\begin{aligned}
C |K^0\rangle' &= -|\bar{K}^0\rangle' \\
T |K^0\rangle' &= |K^0\rangle', \quad T |\bar{K}^0\rangle' = |\bar{K}^0\rangle'.
\end{aligned}
\tag{18}$$

Obviously, the parity operation P are invariant under the phase transformation. Using the antilinear property of time reversal T , one can easily show that CPT operation also remains unchanged.

We now define a phase convention to fix the phase ambiguity given in Eq.(16). A widely used phase convention due to Wu and Yang [11] is

$$\frac{\bar{A}_0}{A_0} = 1. \tag{19}$$

For this case, $q_2/p_2 = 1$ and $E_2 = 0$ when CP invariance holds, since M_{12} and Γ_{12} are then both real. In the standard model, the penguin diagram, which gives contributions only to A_0 and $\bar{A}_0$, contains a phase. Thus it naturally leads to

$$\frac{\bar{A}_2}{A_2} = 1 \text{ and } \frac{\bar{A}_0}{A_0} = e^{i\lambda} \tag{20}$$

where λ is a small phase. Often, it is convenient to choose this phase convention instead of (19).

We call the Wu-Yang phase convention and other phase conventions which lead to

$$\frac{\bar{A}_0}{A_0} \approx 1 \tag{21}$$

”physical” phase conventions.

We give an example of an *unphysical* phase convention. For an illustrative purpose, consider a world in which both CP and CPT are conserved. Then the phase invariant quantity

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{q_2}{p_2} \frac{\bar{A}_0}{A_0} \right) = 0. \tag{22}$$

We can choose a wild phase convention so that

$$\frac{\bar{A}_0}{A_0} = -i. \tag{23}$$

This corresponds to making the transformation

$$\begin{aligned} |K^0\rangle' &= e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}} |K^0\rangle, \\ |\bar{K}^0\rangle' &= e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}} |\bar{K}^0\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $|K^0\rangle'$ and $|\bar{K}^0\rangle'$ follow the Wu-Yang convention. With this phase convention $q_2/p_2 = i$ and $E_1 = 0$ since both M_{12} and Γ_{12} are purely imaginary. Now the CP operation $CP |K^0\rangle' = |\bar{K}^0\rangle'$ corresponds to

$$CP |K^0\rangle = i |\bar{K}^0\rangle \quad (25)$$

and CP eigenstates are

$$\begin{aligned} |K_S\rangle &= \frac{1}{1+i} (|K^0\rangle + i |\bar{K}^0\rangle), \\ |K_L\rangle &= \frac{1}{1-i} (|K^0\rangle - i |\bar{K}^0\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

This implies that if we write q_1/p_1 and q_2/p_2 as

$$\frac{1-\epsilon_1}{1+\epsilon_1} \equiv \frac{q_1}{p_1}, \quad \frac{1-\epsilon_2}{1+\epsilon_2} \equiv \frac{q_2}{p_2}, \quad (27)$$

then $\epsilon_1 = 1/\epsilon_2 = \frac{1-i}{1+i}$. We can, therefore, see that neither nonvanishing $\text{Im } M_{12}, \text{Im } \Gamma_{12}$ nor $\epsilon_{1,2}$ automatically lead to CP violation.

We know experimentally that CP violating effects are very small in the K meson system. Thus it makes sense to confine ourselves to a class of phase convention such that small ϵ and ϵ' imply small $\text{Im } M_{12}$ and $\text{Im } \Gamma_{12}$. In addition, we take

$$C |K^0\rangle = - |\bar{K}^0\rangle \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{cases} T |K^0\rangle = |K^0\rangle \\ T |\bar{K}^0\rangle = |\bar{K}^0\rangle \end{cases}, \quad \begin{cases} P |K^0\rangle = - |K^0\rangle \\ P |\bar{K}^0\rangle = - |\bar{K}^0\rangle \end{cases}. \quad (29)$$

$$CPT |K^0\rangle = |\bar{K}^0\rangle, \quad CP |K^0\rangle = |\bar{K}^0\rangle \quad (30)$$

From Appendix A and Eq.(7) we can see that for this class of physical phase conventions

- CPT conservation $\implies \cos \theta = 0$

- CP conservation $\implies \cos \theta = 0, \sin \phi = 0$
- T conservation $\implies \sin \phi = 0$.

Note that each arrow points only to one direction.

We list below the approximate expressions for various quantities which are valid when we restrict ourselves to the physical phase conventions. First note that

$$E_1^2 + E_2^2 = |M_{12}|^2 + \frac{1}{4} |\Gamma_{12}|^2 + i \text{Re} (M_{12} \Gamma_{12}^*) \quad (31)$$

is independent of phase convention. For the physical phase conventions, we expect the magnitude of E_2 and E_3 to be much smaller than E_1 since the former is at least proportional to one of the CP, T , or CPT violating parameters. So we get $E \simeq E_1$. Picking up their real and imaginary parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_S &= \frac{1}{2} (M_{11} + M_{22} + 2\text{Re } M_{12}), \\ m_L &= \frac{1}{2} (M_{11} + M_{22} - 2\text{Re } M_{12}), \\ \Gamma_S &= \frac{1}{2} (\Gamma_{11} + \Gamma_{22} + 2\text{Re } \Gamma_{12}), \\ \Gamma_L &= \frac{1}{2} (\Gamma_{11} + \Gamma_{22} - 2\text{Re } \Gamma_{12}), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $\Gamma_S(\Gamma_L)$, and $m_S(m_L)$ are the total decay width, and the mass of $K_S(K_L)$. The parameter $\epsilon_1(\epsilon_2)$ represents the small deviation of the mass eigenstate $K_S(K_L)$ from the CP eigenstate $K_+(K_-)$:

$$\begin{aligned} |K_+\rangle &= \frac{|K^0\rangle + |\bar{K}^0\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \\ |K_-\rangle &= \frac{|K^0\rangle - |\bar{K}^0\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

When CPT invariance is a good symmetry, one finds

$$\frac{q_1}{p_1} = \frac{q_2}{p_2} = e^{i\phi}, \quad (34)$$

so that

$$\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = -i \tan \frac{\phi}{2}. \quad (35)$$

It is customary to write ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 as [6,8]

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_1 &= \epsilon_0 + \Delta, \\ \epsilon_2 &= \epsilon_0 - \Delta,\end{aligned}\tag{36}$$

where, if ϵ_0 and Δ are small,

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_0 &\equiv -i\frac{\phi}{2}, \\ \Delta &\equiv -\frac{1}{2}\left(\theta - \frac{\pi}{2}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{37}$$

Above we have taken $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ when $\cos \theta = 0$, and $\phi = 0$ when $\sin \phi = 0$. It is instructive to express these parameters in terms of M_{ij} and Γ_{ij} . Using Eqs. (7), (8) and (37), we get [6]

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_0 &= \frac{-\text{Im } M_{12} + \frac{i}{2}\text{Im } \Gamma_{12}}{\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma - i\Delta m}, \\ \Delta &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{i(M_{11} - M_{22}) + \frac{1}{2}(\Gamma_{11} - \Gamma_{22})}{\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma - i\Delta m},\end{aligned}\tag{38}$$

where $\Delta m = m_L - m_S$, and $\Delta\Gamma \equiv \Gamma_S - \Gamma_L$. From Eq. (37), or using Eq. (38) and Appendix A, we can see that

- $\epsilon_0 \neq 0 \implies CP$ and T violating, but may be CPT conserving,
- $\Delta \neq 0 \implies CP$ and CPT violating, but may be T conserving.

Each discrete symmetry reduces the freedom of A_I and $\bar{A}_I$ as follows;

- CPT conservation $\implies A_I = \bar{A}_I^*$
- CP conservation $\implies A_I = \bar{A}_I$
- T conservation $\implies \text{Im } A_I = 0 = \text{Im } \bar{A}_I$.

If we regard $\text{Im } A_I/\text{Re } A_I$, $\text{Im } \bar{A}_I/\text{Re } A_I$ and $(1 - \text{Re } \bar{A}_I/\text{Re } A_I)$ as so small that they are the same order quantities as ϵ_1, ϵ_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon &= \epsilon_2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\text{Re } \bar{A}_0}{\text{Re } A_0}\right) + \frac{i}{2} \left(\frac{\text{Im } A_0}{\text{Re } A_0} - \frac{\text{Im } \bar{A}_0}{\text{Re } A_0}\right), \\ \epsilon' &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\omega e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \left[\left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\text{Re } \bar{A}_2}{\text{Re } A_2}\right) - \left(1 - \frac{\text{Re } \bar{A}_0}{\text{Re } A_0}\right) \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + i \left\{ \left(\frac{\text{Im } A_2}{\text{Re } A_2} - \frac{\text{Im } \bar{A}_2}{\text{Re } A_2}\right) - \left(\frac{\text{Im } A_0}{\text{Re } A_0} - \frac{\text{Im } \bar{A}_0}{\text{Re } A_0}\right) \right\} \right],\end{aligned}\tag{39}$$

Following to the Wu-Yang phase convention $\text{Im } A_0 = 0$ [11] and using Eq.(38) we can rewrite ϵ in Eq.(39) as follows;

$$\epsilon = \left[\frac{-\text{Im } M_{12} + \frac{1}{2}\text{Im } \Gamma_{12}}{\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma - i\Delta m} - \frac{i \text{Im } \bar{A}_0}{2 A_0} \right] - \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{i(M_{11} - M_{22}) + \frac{1}{2}(\Gamma_{11} - \Gamma_{22})}{\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma - i\Delta m} + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\text{Re } \bar{A}_0}{A_0} \right) \right]. \quad (40)$$

In this equation each term in the second bracket is CPT violating. Define the so-called superweak phase ϕ_{SW} as

$$e^{-i\phi_{SW}} \equiv \frac{\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma - i\Delta m}{\sqrt{(\Delta m)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma\right)^2}}. \quad (41)$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon \cdot e^{-i\phi_{SW}} &= \frac{-\text{Im } M_{12} + \frac{1}{2}\text{Im } \Gamma_{12}}{\sqrt{(\Delta m)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma\right)^2}} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{i(M_{11} - M_{22}) + \frac{1}{2}(\Gamma_{11} - \Gamma_{22})}{\sqrt{(\Delta m)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma\right)^2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{A}_0}{A_0} \right) \frac{\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma - i\Delta m}{\sqrt{(\Delta m)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma\right)^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

By taking its imaginary part we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } (\epsilon \cdot e^{-i\phi_{SW}}) &= \frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2\Delta m} \sin \phi_{SW} \left[\frac{\text{Im } \Gamma_{12}}{\Delta\Gamma} - \frac{M_{11} - M_{22}}{\Delta\Gamma} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\Delta m}{\Delta\Gamma} \left(1 - \frac{\text{Re } \bar{A}_0}{A_0} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\text{Im } \bar{A}_0}{A_0} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Now we discuss the experimental constraint to CPT violation. Experiment [13] measures η_{+-} and η_{00} . Then the value of the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } (\epsilon \cdot e^{-i\phi_{SW}}) &\simeq |\eta_{+-}| \left(\frac{2}{3}\phi_{+-} + \frac{1}{3}\phi_{00} - \phi_{SW} \right) \\ &= (1.3 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-4}, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

which is obtained using the fact that $|\eta_{+-}| \simeq |\eta_{00}| \simeq |\epsilon|$, and $\phi_{+-} \simeq \phi_{00}$, can be determined.

If we define ξ as

$$\xi \equiv \arg(\Gamma_{12} A_0 \bar{A}_0^*) \simeq 2 \frac{\text{Im } \Gamma_{12}}{\Delta\Gamma} - \frac{\text{Im } \bar{A}_0}{A_0}, \quad (44)$$

we can deduce from Eq.(42)

$$\frac{\xi}{2} - \frac{M_{11} - M_{22}}{\Delta\Gamma} - \frac{\Delta m}{\Delta\Gamma} \left(1 - \frac{\text{Re } \bar{A}_0}{A_0}\right) = (1.8 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{-4}, \quad (45)$$

which is the expression obtained by Lavoura [12]. Note that $\xi \neq 0$ even when CPT invariance holds. As pointed out by Lavoura [12] and earlier by Lee and Wu [9], the above experimental result does not supply CPT test as long as the value of ξ is not determined with some accuracy. The contributions to ξ from semileptonic decay modes($\xi(\pi l \nu)$), and from 3π modes($\xi(3\pi)$) can be as large as [9,12]

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(\pi l \nu) &= 1.9 \times 10^{-4}, \\ \xi(3\pi) &= 3.8 \times 10^{-4}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Hence from Eq.(45) these imply that

$$39.5^\circ < \arg \epsilon < 47.4^\circ. \quad (47)$$

Comparing $\text{Im} \left(\epsilon \cdot e^{-i\phi_{SW}} \right)$ with the size of ϵ , and taking its theoretical error into account, we can say optimistically that CPT is good up to 10 %.

D. Semileptonic decays

The amplitudes for semileptonic decays are given as follows [6];

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \pi^- l^+ \nu_l | T | K^0 \rangle &= F_l (1 - y_l), \\ \langle \pi^- l^+ \nu_l | T | \bar{K}^0 \rangle &= x_l F_l (1 - y_l), \\ \langle \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l | T | K^0 \rangle &= \bar{x}_l^* F_l^* (1 + y_l^*), \\ \langle \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l | T | \bar{K}^0 \rangle &= F_l^* (1 + y_l^*) \quad (l = e, \mu). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

These match with the physical phase convention since the meaning of each parameter is characterized by

- $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule $\implies x_l = \bar{x}_l = 0$
- CPT conservation $\implies y_l = 0, x_l = \bar{x}_l$
- CP conservation $\implies x_l = \bar{x}_l^*, F_l = F_l^*, y_l = -y_l^*$.

E. Probability densities for semileptonic decays for K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$ beams

Before making contact with experiments previously performed for the x and $\bar{x}_l$, we list here several time dependent probability functions.

Let $|K(t)\rangle$ be a state which starts out as $|K^0\rangle$ at $t = 0$, and $|\bar{K}(t)\rangle$ be a state which starts out as $|\bar{K}^0\rangle$ at $t = 0$. Then the time dependence of $|K(t)\rangle$ and $|\bar{K}(t)\rangle$ are given as:

$$|K(t)\rangle = \frac{1}{p_1 q_2 + p_2 q_1} \left[(p_1 q_2 |K^0\rangle + q_1 q_2 |\bar{K}^0\rangle) e^{-im_S t - \frac{\Gamma_S}{2} t} + (p_2 q_1 |K^0\rangle - q_1 q_2 |\bar{K}^0\rangle) e^{-im_L t - \frac{\Gamma_L}{2} t} \right], \quad (49)$$

$$|\bar{K}(t)\rangle = \frac{1}{p_1 q_2 + p_2 q_1} \left[(p_1 p_2 |K^0\rangle + p_2 q_1 |\bar{K}^0\rangle) e^{-im_S t - \frac{\Gamma_S}{2} t} - (p_1 p_2 |K^0\rangle - p_1 q_2 |\bar{K}^0\rangle) e^{-im_L t - \frac{\Gamma_L}{2} t} \right].$$

The following quantities are the probabilities at time t for the states $|K(t)\rangle$ and $|\bar{K}(t)\rangle$ to decay into $\pi^- l^+ \nu_l$ or $\pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l$ [6];

$$\begin{aligned} P_{l+} &\equiv \left| \langle \pi^- l^+ \nu_l | T | K(t) \rangle \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{|F_l|^2}{|p_1 q_2 + p_2 q_1|^2} |1 - y_l|^2 \\ &\quad \times \left| p_1 q_2 \left(1 + \frac{q_1}{p_1} x_l \right) e^{-im_S t - \frac{\Gamma_S}{2} t} + p_2 q_1 \left(1 - \frac{q_2}{p_2} x_l \right) e^{-im_L t - \frac{\Gamma_L}{2} t} \right|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

$$(51)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}_{l+} &\equiv \left| \langle \pi^- l^+ \nu_l | T | \bar{K}(t) \rangle \right|^2 \\ &= |F_l|^2 \frac{|p_1 p_2|^2}{|p_1 q_2 + p_2 q_1|^2} |1 - y_l|^2 \\ &\quad \times \left| \left(1 + \frac{q_1}{p_1} x_l \right) e^{-im_S t - \frac{\Gamma_S}{2} t} - \left(1 - \frac{q_2}{p_2} x_l \right) e^{-im_L t - \frac{\Gamma_L}{2} t} \right|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

$$\begin{aligned} P_{l-} &\equiv \left| \langle \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l | T | K(t) \rangle \right|^2 \\ &= |F_l|^2 \frac{|q_1 q_2|^2}{|p_1 q_2 + p_2 q_1|^2} |1 + y_l^*|^2 \\ &\quad \times \left| \left(1 + \frac{p_1}{q_1} \bar{x}_l^* \right) e^{-im_S t - \frac{\Gamma_S}{2} t} - \left(1 - \frac{p_2}{q_2} \bar{x}_l^* \right) e^{-im_L t - \frac{\Gamma_L}{2} t} \right|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{P}_{l-} &\equiv \left| \left\langle \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l | T | \bar{K}(t) \right\rangle \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{|F_l|^2}{|p_1 q_2 + p_2 q_1|^2} |1 + y_l^*|^2 \\
&\quad \times \left| p_2 q_1 \left(1 + \frac{p_1}{q_1} \bar{x}_l^* \right) e^{-im_S t - \frac{\Gamma_S}{2} t} + p_1 q_2 \left(1 - \frac{p_2}{q_2} \bar{x}_l^* \right) e^{-im_L t - \frac{\Gamma_L}{2} t} \right|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

where $\Gamma \equiv \Gamma_S + \Gamma_L$. We should note that we can measure at best phase-convention independent quantities:

$$1 + \frac{q_1}{p_1} x_l, \quad 1 - \frac{q_2}{p_2} x_l, \quad 1 + \frac{p_1}{q_1} \bar{x}_l, \quad 1 - \frac{p_2}{q_2} \bar{x}_l, \tag{55}$$

and so on. However, as already assumed in previous several subsections, we carry out the computation up to the first order in $\epsilon_0, \Delta, x_l, \bar{x}_l$ and y_l based on the physical phase convention. While it is trivial to continue to perform the general computation, we found it neither useful nor instructive at this stage. Then the equations encountered previously become

$$\begin{aligned}
|K(t)\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\left\{ (1 + 2\Delta) |K^0\rangle + (1 - 2\epsilon_0) |\bar{K}^0\rangle \right\} e^{-im_S t - \frac{\Gamma_S}{2} t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left\{ (1 - 2\Delta) |K^0\rangle - (1 - 2\epsilon_0) |\bar{K}^0\rangle \right\} e^{-im_L t - \frac{\Gamma_L}{2} t} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\bar{K}(t)\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\left\{ (1 + 2\epsilon_0) |K^0\rangle + (1 - 2\Delta) |\bar{K}^0\rangle \right\} e^{-im_S t - \frac{\Gamma_S}{2} t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left\{ (1 + 2\epsilon_0) |K^0\rangle - (1 + 2\Delta) |\bar{K}^0\rangle \right\} e^{-im_L t - \frac{\Gamma_L}{2} t} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{l+} &= \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 \left[(1 - 2\text{Re } y_l - 2\text{Re } (2\Delta + x_l)) e^{-\Gamma_L t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1 - 2\text{Re } y_l + 2\text{Re } (2\Delta + x_l)) e^{-\Gamma_S t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} t} \{ (1 - 2\text{Re } y_l) \cos(\Delta m t) - 2\text{Im } (2\Delta + x_l) \sin(\Delta m t) \} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{P}_{l+} &= \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 \left[(1 + 2\text{Re } (2\epsilon_0 - y_l) - 2\text{Re } x_l) e^{-\Gamma_L t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1 + 2\text{Re } (2\epsilon_0 - y_l) + 2\text{Re } x_l) e^{-\Gamma_S t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} t} \{ (1 + 2\text{Re } (2\epsilon_0 - y_l)) \cos(\Delta m t) - 2\text{Im } x_l \sin(\Delta m t) \} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{l-} = & \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 \left[(1 - 2\text{Re}(2\epsilon_0 - y_l) - 2\text{Re} \bar{x}_l) e^{-\Gamma_L t} \right. \\
& + (1 - 2\text{Re}(2\epsilon_0 - y_l) + 2\text{Re} \bar{x}_l) e^{-\Gamma_S t} \\
& \left. - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \{ (1 - 2\text{Re}(2\epsilon_0 - y_l)) \cos(\Delta m t) + 2\text{Im} \bar{x}_l \sin(\Delta m t) \} \right], \tag{59}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{P}_{l-} = & \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 \left[(1 + 2\text{Re} y_l + 2\text{Re}(2\Delta - \bar{x}_l)) e^{-\Gamma_L t} \right. \\
& + (1 + 2\text{Re} y_l - 2\text{Re}(2\Delta - \bar{x}_l)) e^{-\Gamma_S t} \\
& \left. + 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \{ (1 + 2\text{Re} y_l) \cos(\Delta m t) + 2\text{Im}(2\Delta + \bar{x}_l) \sin(\Delta m t) \} \right], \tag{60}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, CPT violation is characterized by nonvanishing $x_l - \bar{x}_l$ or y_l , representing the violations in the leptonic decay amplitudes, and by Δ , representing the violation in the $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mass matrix. Note that only the combination of $2\Delta + x_l$, and $2\Delta - \bar{x}_l^*$ can be determined from Eq.(57), and Eq.(60), respectively. Thus the test of CPT symmetry (nonvanishing Δ or $x_l - \bar{x}_l$) can not be performed without further information on the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule.

F. The experimental situation for $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ violation

First note that according to the Review of Particle Properties [3] there is no new experimental results on the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule since 1973. All existing experiments observe the quantities corresponding to P_{l+} and P_{l-} for the determination of x [14]. Parameters which account for CP, T and CPT violations were ignored. In this limit, Eqs. (57), and (59) reduces to [14]

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{l+} = & \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 \left[(1 - 2\text{Re} x_l) e^{-\Gamma_L t} + (1 + 2\text{Re} x_l) e^{-\Gamma_S t} \right. \\
& \left. + 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta m t) - 4\text{Im} x_l e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \sin(\Delta m t) \right], \tag{61}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{l-} = & \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 \left[(1 - 2\text{Re} x_l) e^{-\Gamma_L t} + (1 + 2\text{Re} x_l) e^{-\Gamma_S t} \right. \\
& \left. - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta m t) - 4\text{Im} x_l e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \sin(\Delta m t) \right], \tag{62}
\end{aligned}$$

respectively. The statistical average of all experiments gives [3]

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Re } x &= 0.006 \pm 0.018, \\ \text{Im } x &= -0.003 \pm 0.026,\end{aligned}\tag{63}$$

(x 's for K_{e3} and $K_{\mu3}$ are combined) while individual experiments have error of order 0.03. At the present experimental accuracy, CP, T and CPT violation can be neglected in the determination of x . However as suggested in the Ref. [16], the LEAR experiment may reach 6×10^{-4} for $\text{Re } x$ and 7×10^{-4} for $\text{Im } x$. At this level it is important to keep all the parameters.

III. MEASUREMENTS AT A ϕ FACTORY

In this section, we discuss how to extract the values of parameters characterizing the K^0 - $\bar{K}^0$ system at a ϕ factory. A ϕ factory is expected to produce a large number of K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$ through the decay $\phi \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$. Because strong interaction conserves CP and ϕ is CP odd, $K^0 \bar{K}^0$ state assumes the form

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ |K^0\rangle_{\mathbf{p}} |\bar{K}^0\rangle_{-\mathbf{p}} - |\bar{K}^0\rangle_{\mathbf{p}} |K^0\rangle_{-\mathbf{p}} \right\}.\tag{64}$$

Here $\mathbf{p}$ is the space momentum of one of the two K mesons at the ϕ rest frame. Each K meson evolves in time according to Eq. (56). Let one of them decay to the final state $|f_1\rangle$ at time t_1 , and the other to $|f_2\rangle$ at time t_2 . The amplitude for such a process is given by

$$\begin{aligned}A(f_1, t_1; f_2, t_2) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\langle f_1 | T | K(t_1) \rangle \langle f_2 | T | \bar{K}(t_2) \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \langle f_1 | T | \bar{K}(t_1) \rangle \langle f_2 | T | K(t_2) \rangle \right].\end{aligned}\tag{65}$$

The relative time probability distribution function, which is defined by

$$|A(\Delta t; f_1, f_2)| \equiv \frac{1}{2} \int_{|\Delta t|}^{\infty} d(t_1 + t_2) |A(f_1, t_1; f_2, t_2)|^2,\tag{66}$$

with $\Delta t = t_1 - t_2$, plays the central role in our foregoing analysis. This quantity is especially useful as the determination of $t_1 + t_2$ at a ϕ factory is often accompanied by a large error.

Since we are interested in observing the violations of the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule, CPT and CP symmetry, we shall deal with $f_1, f_2 = \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^0 \pi^0$, etc. For completeness we give the expressions for $|A(f_1, t_1; f_2, t_2)|^2$, and for the relative time probability distribution functions in Appendix C, and in Appendix D, respectively. They are also useful when various efficiency and errors must be folded in to the experimental data.

As claimed in the introduction, we focus our attention to various asymmetries, each of which are obtained by taking the ratio of the difference and the sum of two different observables. we list the time integrated asymmetries in Sec.III A, and Δt dependent asymmetries in Sec.III B.

A. Time integrated asymmetries

In the $f_1 = \pi^+ \pi^-, f_2 = \pi^0 \pi^0$ mode,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^{\pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^0 \pi^0} &= \frac{\int_0^\infty d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^0 \pi^0)|^2 - \int_{-\infty}^0 d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^0 \pi^0)|^2}{\int_0^\infty d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^0 \pi^0)|^2 + \int_{-\infty}^0 d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^0 \pi^0)|^2} \\ &= 3\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon), \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

which was obtained in Ref. [7,8,15] remains obviously unaffected even when the possibility of $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule violation is taken into account, since they appear only in the semileptonic decay channel. In obtaining Eq.(67), we have used $\Gamma_L/\Gamma_S \sim 10^{-3}$. $\mathcal{A}^{\pi^+ \pi^-, \pi' \pi'}$ reflects the difference ϵ' between η_{+-} and η_{00} (see Eq. (13)). Ref. [15] notices that the measurement of the double ratio $R \equiv |\eta_{+-}/\eta_{00}|^2 \simeq 1 + 6\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon)$ enables us to determine $\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon)$ more accurately than any other observable such as $\mathcal{A}^{\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0 \pi^0}$, since the cancellation of most of systematic errors can be reached.

For $f_1 = \pi^- l^+ \nu_l$ and $f_2 = \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l$, $|A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2$ is an even function of Δt if CPT is not violated. Thus the following characterizes CPT violation

$$\mathcal{A}_{l^+ l^-}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\equiv \frac{\int_0^\infty d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2 - \int_{-\infty}^0 d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2}{\int_0^\infty d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2 + \int_{-\infty}^0 d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2} \\
&= -4\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l.
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Here $\bar{\Delta}_l$ is defined by

$$2\bar{\Delta}_l \equiv 2\Delta + x_l - \bar{x}_l^*. \tag{69}$$

The relative time probability distribution for $f_1 = \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l$, $f_2 = \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l$ and the one for $f_1 = \pi^- l^+ \nu_l$, $f_2 = \pi^- l^+ \nu_l$ differ only by the overall magnitude, so that the following quantity seems useful

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{A}(\pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi^- l^+ \nu_l) \\
&\equiv \frac{\int_{-\infty}^\infty d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2 - \int_{-\infty}^\infty d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^- l^+ \nu_l)|^2}{\int_{-\infty}^\infty d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2 + \int_{-\infty}^\infty d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^- l^+ \nu_l)|^2} \\
&= -4\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l).
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

The $\pi\pi$ ($= \pi^+\pi^-$ or $\pi^0\pi^0$) channel can be used to measure $\delta_l(\infty)$ (see Eq. (72)) through the following quantity

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{A}_{\pi\pi, l^+ l^-}^+ \\
&\equiv \frac{\int_0^\infty d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi\pi)|^2 - \int_0^\infty d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi\pi)|^2}{\int_0^\infty d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi\pi)|^2 + \int_0^\infty d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi\pi)|^2} \\
&= 2\left\{ \text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \text{Re } (\bar{\Delta}_l) - 2|\eta_{\pi\pi}| \frac{\Gamma_L}{\Gamma_S} \cos \phi_{SW} \cdot \cos(\phi_{\pi\pi} + \phi_{SW}) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Numerically Γ_L/Γ_S , $|\eta_{\pi\pi}| \sim 10^{-3}$ so that (71) reduces to the usual asymmetric quantity $\delta_l(\infty)$;

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_l(\infty) &\equiv \frac{\Gamma_L(\pi^- l^+ \nu_l) - \Gamma_L(\pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)}{\Gamma_L(\pi^- l^+ \nu_l) + \Gamma_L(\pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)} \\
&= 2\left\{ \text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \text{Re } (\bar{\Delta}_l) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

We can construct the quantity which is the counterpart of $\mathcal{A}_{\pi\pi, l^+ l^-}^+$ as follows;

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{A}_{\pi\pi, l^+ l^-}^- \\
&\equiv \frac{\int_{-\infty}^0 d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi\pi)|^2 - \int_{-\infty}^0 d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi\pi)|^2}{\int_{-\infty}^0 d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi\pi)|^2 + \int_{-\infty}^0 d(\Delta t) |A(\Delta t; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi\pi)|^2} \\
&= 2\left\{ \text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \text{Re } (\bar{\Delta}_l) - 2|\eta_{\pi\pi}| \cos \phi_{SW} \cdot \cos(\phi_{\pi\pi} - \phi_{SW}) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

The value of $\phi_{\pi\pi}$ will be fixed by the measurement of $\mathcal{A}_{\pi\pi,l^+l^-}^-$ [8] after determination of $\delta_l(\infty)$ and, $|\eta_{\pi\pi}|$, for example, by using $\mathcal{A}_{\pi\pi,l^+l^-}^+$, and $|A(\pi\pi, t)|^2$ (see Eq.(79) in Sec.III B).

Inclusive semileptonic decay mode, in which one final state is specified to be $\pi^+l^-\bar{\nu}_l$ or $\pi^-l^+\nu_l$ and the other one is not restricted, may enable us to perform more accurate measurements of parameters through accumulating larger number of events. $\mathcal{A}_{l^+l^-}^{\text{inclusive}}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{l^+l^-}^{\text{inclusive}} &\equiv \frac{\int_0^\infty dt |A(\pi^-l^+\nu_l, t)|^2 - \int_0^\infty dt |A(\pi^+l^-\bar{\nu}_l, t)|^2}{\int_0^\infty dt |A(\pi^-l^+\nu_l, t)|^2 + \int_0^\infty dt |A(\pi^+l^-\bar{\nu}_l, t)|^2} \\ &= 2\{\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \text{Re}(\bar{\Delta}_l)\},\end{aligned}\tag{74}$$

with

$$|A(\pi^-l^+\nu_l, t)|^2 \equiv \sum_f \int_0^\infty dt' |A(\pi^-l^+\nu_l, t; f, t')|^2.\tag{75}$$

So $\mathcal{A}_{l^+l^-}^{\text{inclusive}}$ is equal to $\delta_l(\infty)$ apart from numerically negligible constants.

The counterpart to $\delta_l(\infty)$, $\bar{\delta}_l(\infty)$ corresponding to the K_S decay can be determined from

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\delta}_l(\infty) &\equiv \frac{\Gamma_S(\pi^-l^+\nu_l) - \Gamma_S(\pi^+l^-\bar{\nu}_l)}{\Gamma_S(\pi^-l^+\nu_l) + \Gamma_S(\pi^+l^-\bar{\nu}_l)} \\ &= 2\{\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) + \text{Re}(\bar{\Delta}_l)\}.\end{aligned}\tag{76}$$

Its observation is restricted to the semileptonic K_S decay measurement with K_L tagging. Thus it appears only as the coefficients of $e^{-\Gamma_S \Delta t}$ (or $e^{-\Gamma_S t}$) in the expressions of the various relative time distribution functions (or the time distributions of semileptonic decay).

B. Δt dependent asymmetries

With recent development in technology, it is now possible to increase the resolution of the decay vertex point determination to about $20\mu m$. This allows us to obtain additional information. More precisely, some interference terms whose time dependences are periodic with exponential damping, give large contributions at $t = \mathcal{O}(\tau_S)$, where $\tau_S = 1/\Gamma_S$. The effects of such interference terms can be better observed in asymmetries which depend on Δt .

To make it more explicit, we list the following quantity

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{A}^{l^+l^-}(\Delta t) \\
& \equiv \frac{|A(\Delta t > 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2 - |A(-\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2}{|A(\Delta t > 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2 + |A(-\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2} \\
& = -\frac{4\text{Re}(\bar{\Delta}_l)(e^{-\Gamma_L \Delta t} - e^{-\Gamma_S \Delta t}) + 8\text{Im}(\bar{\Delta}_l)e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}\Delta t} \sin(\Delta m \Delta t)}{e^{-\Gamma_L \Delta t} + e^{-\Gamma_S \Delta t} + 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}\Delta t} \cos(\Delta m \Delta t)}, \tag{77}
\end{aligned}$$

which will reduce to the result obtained by Ref. [8] when $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ violating parameter $x_l, \bar{x}_l$ is set equal to 0. When $\Delta t = (0 \sim 15)\tau_S$, the contribution of sin-term to the total behavior is still large due to the factor $\frac{1}{2}$ in the exponential so that we can make a best fit to deduce the value of $\text{Im } \bar{\Delta}_l$. Note that $\Delta m \Delta t$ varies by a factor of 2π for the range $0 \lesssim \Delta t \lesssim 15\tau_S$. For large Δt ($\Delta t \gtrsim 20\tau_S$), $\mathcal{A}^{l^+l^-}$ is sensitive to the term proportional to $\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l$. Therefore, both $\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l$ and $\text{Im } \bar{\Delta}_l$ can be observed by examining the time evolution during $\Delta t = (0 \sim 15)\tau_S$ and also $\Delta t \gtrsim 20\tau_S$.

From the $f_1 = \pi^+\pi^-$, $f_2 = \pi^0\pi^0$ mode, the value of $\text{Im } \epsilon'/\epsilon$ can be measured by observing the small Δt behavior ($\Delta t = (0 \sim 15)/\tau_S$) of the quantity [8]

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{A}(\Delta t; \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^0\pi^0) \\
& \equiv \frac{|A(\Delta t > 0; \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^0\pi^0)|^2 - |A(-\Delta t; \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^0\pi^0)|^2}{|A(\Delta t > 0; \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^0\pi^0)|^2 + |A(-\Delta t; \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^0\pi^0)|^2} \\
& = 3 \frac{\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon)(e^{-\Gamma_L \Delta t} - e^{-\Gamma_S \Delta t}) - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}\Delta t} \text{Im}(\epsilon'/\epsilon) \sin(\Delta m \Delta t)}{e^{-\Gamma_L \Delta t} + e^{-\Gamma_S \Delta t} - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}\Delta t} \cos(\Delta m \Delta t)}. \tag{78}
\end{aligned}$$

From the inclusive $\pi\pi$ decay mode, we cannot construct any asymmetric quantities. However the conventional method of detecting $|\eta_{\pi\pi}|$ is also applicable at a ϕ factory [8]

$$\begin{aligned}
|A(\pi\pi, t)|^2 & \equiv \sum_f \int_0^\infty dt' |A(\pi\pi, t; f, t')|^2 \\
& = \frac{1}{2} |\langle \pi\pi | T | K_S \rangle|^2 \left\{ |\eta_{\pi\pi}|^2 e^{-\Gamma_L t} + e^{-\Gamma_S t} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - 2 |\eta_{\pi\pi}| |\langle K_S | K_L \rangle| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta m t - \phi_{\pi\pi} - \phi_{LS}) \right\}. \tag{79}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle K_L | K_S \rangle & \equiv |\langle K_L | K_S \rangle| e^{i\phi_{LS}} \\
& = 2\{\text{Re } \epsilon_0 + i\text{Im } \Delta\}. \tag{80}
\end{aligned}$$

As noted above in Sec.3.1, the time evolutions of $|A(\Delta t; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2$ and $|A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^- l^+ \nu_l)|^2$ are the same so that the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(\Delta t; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi^- l^+ \nu_l) & \\ & \equiv \frac{|A(\Delta t; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2 - |A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^- l^+ \nu_l)|^2}{|A(\Delta t; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2 + |A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^- l^+ \nu_l)|^2} \\ & = -4\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l), \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

is constant in Δt [15]. It appears to be the most suitable observable for determining $\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l)$ since it is possible to take the average of the values of $\mathcal{A}(\Delta t; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi^- l^+ \nu_l)$ at various relative times Δt .

Corresponding to the quantities $\mathcal{A}_{\pi\pi, l^+ l^-}^+$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\pi\pi, l^+ l^-}^-$, one can consider the following respective asymmetries

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^{\pi\pi}(\Delta t > 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l) & \\ & \equiv \frac{|A(\Delta t > 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi\pi)|^2 - |A(\Delta t > 0; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi\pi)|^2}{|A(\Delta t > 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi\pi)|^2 + |A(\Delta t > 0; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi\pi)|^2} \\ & = 2 \frac{(\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \text{Re}(\bar{\Delta}_l))e^{-\Gamma_L \Delta t} - |\eta_{\pi\pi}| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} \Delta t} \cos(\Delta m \Delta t + \phi_{\pi\pi})}{e^{-\Gamma_L \Delta t} + |\eta_{\pi\pi}|^2 e^{-\Gamma_S \Delta t}}, \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^{\pi\pi}(\Delta t < 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l) & \\ & \equiv \frac{|A(\Delta t < 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi\pi)|^2 - |A(\Delta t < 0; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi\pi)|^2}{|A(\Delta t < 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi\pi)|^2 + |A(\Delta t < 0; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi\pi)|^2} \\ & = 2 \frac{(\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \text{Re}(\bar{\Delta}_l))e^{-\Gamma_S |\Delta t|} - |\eta_{\pi\pi}| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} |\Delta t|} \cos(\Delta m |\Delta t| - \phi_{\pi\pi})}{e^{-\Gamma_S |\Delta t|} + |\eta_{\pi\pi}|^2 e^{-\Gamma_L |\Delta t|}}. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

From the large Δt behavior of $\mathcal{A}^{\pi\pi}(\Delta t > 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)$, the combination $(\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \text{Re}(\bar{\Delta}_l))$ which is just half of $\delta_l(\infty)$ will be measured. The interference term in $\mathcal{A}^{\pi\pi}(\Delta t < 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)$ may provide us with the value of $\phi_{\pi\pi}$.

Finally, in the semileptonic inclusive decay mode one can construct the following asymmetric quantity

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{l^+l^-}^{\text{inclusive}}(t) &\equiv \frac{|A(\pi^-l^+\nu_l, t)|^2 - |A(\pi^+l^-\bar{\nu}_l, t)|^2}{|A(\pi^-l^+\nu_l, t)|^2 + |A(\pi^+l^-\bar{\nu}_l, t)|^2} \\
&= \frac{2}{e^{-\Gamma_L t} + e^{-\Gamma_S t}} \left[\left\{ \text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \text{Re}(\bar{\Delta}_l) \right\} e^{-\Gamma_L t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left\{ \text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) + \text{Re}(\bar{\Delta}_l) \right\} e^{-\Gamma_S t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - |\langle K_S | K_L \rangle| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta m t - \phi_{LS}) \right], \tag{84}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, as can be seen in Eq.(80), we can determine the values of $\text{Re } \epsilon_0$ and $\text{Im } \Delta$ from the behavior of $\mathcal{A}_{l^+l^-}^{\text{inclusive}}(t)$ around $\Delta t = (0 \sim 15)\tau_S$.

We summarize the measurement at a ϕ factory in Table I. Measurements of the parameters from Γ_S to ϵ are the same as in Ref. [8]. We include their results in that table for completeness. Note that $\text{Re } \Delta$, $\text{Re } x_l$ and $\text{Re } \bar{x}_l$ appear only as a combination of $2\bar{\Delta}_l = 2\Delta + (x_l - \bar{x}_l^*)$. Thus we *cannot* measure $\text{Re } \Delta$ and $\text{Re } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)$ *separately* at a ϕ factory [17]. To make further progress, we must turn to the experiments with tagged kaon beam.

IV. FURTHER MEASUREMENTS WITH TAGGED K

We now ask if all the parameters remained undetermined at the ϕ factory can be fixed by the experiments with kaon tagging.

We can use the probabilities $P_{l^+}, \bar{P}_{l^+}, P_{l^-}$ and $\bar{P}_{l^-}$ in Sec.2 to define time dependent asymmetries. The most familiar one is $\beta(t)$ which have been often referred [6,18] in the context of Kabir's direct test for T violation.

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_l(t) &\equiv \frac{\bar{P}_{l^+} - P_{l^-}}{\bar{P}_{l^+} + P_{l^-}} \\
&= \frac{1}{e^{-\Gamma_L t} + e^{-\Gamma_S t} - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta m t)} \left[A e^{-\Gamma_L t} + B e^{-\Gamma_S t} + C e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta m t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + D e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \sin(\Delta m t) \right]. \tag{85}
\end{aligned}$$

The explicit expressions for the coefficients $A - D$ are shown in Table II. The size of $\beta_l(t)$ is of order of small parameters; it is zero as long as CP, CPT symmetry and $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule hold. We define a parameter $\alpha_l(t)$ which has a similar property:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_l(t) &\equiv \frac{\bar{P}_{l-} - P_{l+}}{\bar{P}_{l-} + P_{l+}} \\
&= \frac{1}{e^{-\Gamma_L t} + e^{-\Gamma_S t} + 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta mt)} \left[A e^{-\Gamma_L t} + B e^{-\Gamma_S t} + C e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta mt) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + D e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \sin(\Delta mt) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

The coefficients $A - D$ are also listed in Table II.

If it is possible to achieve the time resolution much less than τ_S , all the coefficients A, B, C and D can be obtained in $\alpha_l(t)$ and $\beta_l(t)$. We can then determine $\text{Re } \Delta$ and $\text{Re } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)$ as shown in Table II. However $\beta_l(t)$, and $\alpha_l(t)$ are not enough to find the values of $\text{Re } x_l$ and $\text{Re } \bar{x}_l$. The values of $\text{Im } x_l$ and $\text{Im } \bar{x}_l$ also remain undetermined. To remedy this situation we construct 4 further asymmetries as follows;

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_l(t) &\equiv \frac{P_{l+} - P_{l-}}{P_{l+} + P_{l-}}, & \bar{\delta}_l(t) &\equiv \frac{\bar{P}_{l+} - \bar{P}_{l-}}{\bar{P}_{l+} + \bar{P}_{l-}}, \\
\eta_l(t) &\equiv \frac{\bar{P}_{l+} - P_{l+}}{\bar{P}_{l+} + P_{l+}}, & \bar{\eta}_l(t) &\equiv \frac{\bar{P}_{l-} - P_{l-}}{\bar{P}_{l-} + P_{l-}},
\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

Explicit expressions for these asymmetries have the following common form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda &= \frac{2}{e^{-\Gamma_L t} + e^{-\Gamma_S t}} \left[A e^{-\Gamma_L t} + B e^{-\Gamma_S t} + C e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta mt) + D e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \sin(\Delta mt) \right. \\
&\quad + E \frac{e^{-\Gamma_L t}}{e^{-\Gamma_L t} + e^{-\Gamma_S t}} e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta mt) + F \frac{e^{-\Gamma_S t}}{e^{-\Gamma_L t} + e^{-\Gamma_S t}} e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta mt) \\
&\quad \left. + G \frac{e^{-\Gamma t}}{e^{-\Gamma_L t} + e^{-\Gamma_S t}} \cos^2(\Delta mt) + H \frac{e^{-\Gamma t}}{e^{-\Gamma_L t} + e^{-\Gamma_S t}} \sin(\Delta mt) \cos(\Delta mt) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

The coefficients in each Λ are shown in Table IV.

Note that the difference between the functional form of Λ and those of α_l and β_l originates from the fact that all Λ 's approach 1 in the limit of CP, CPT conservation and exact $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule. We also point out that Λ 's may be useful as they do not depend on an overall normalization factor.

We summarize the procedure for determining $x_l, \bar{x}_l$ from Λ 's in Table V. Suppose that the experimental analysis can make a best fit to the time dependent data using the functional form given above with $A - H$. Then we can determine all the parameters as shown in Table V.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The main aim of high energy physics, at present, is to find the physics beyond the standard model. One possible approach is to build larger and larger accelerators which may be capable of producing new particles. Another way is to search for fine deviation from the standard model predictions which can be attributed to quantum effects of new physics. The most effective way to proceed with the latter, in our opinion, is to search for deviations from the standard model predictions on CP violating observables. The standard model does not offer any understanding as to the origin of the CP violation. If new physics is to show up at all, it is most likely to appear in CP violating observables.

Our aim of this paper is to establish a systematic method for testing the fundamental symmetries, CP, T , and CPT , in the future collider experiments. The most attractive candidate for that purpose is ϕ factory project. We also take into account of the possibility of large $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule violation in the $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ system, which may be recognized as a result of some high energy physics beyond the standard model.

In order to measure CP, T, CPT , and $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule violations, we construct all possible asymmetries, accessible to the neutral kaon system, and evaluate them in terms of various parameters characterizing the symmetry violations. We summarize our findings as follows;

1. As summarized in Table I, we showed that not all parameters can be determined if we focus our attention only on the ϕ factory experiment as shown in Sec.III.
2. With respect to the CPT violation in the $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mass matrix we see there that only the combination $\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_I = \text{Re } \Delta + \text{Re } (x_I - \bar{x}_I)$ can be determined, and that the separate measurement of $\text{Re } \Delta$ and $\text{Re } (x_I + \bar{x}_I)$ cannot be achieved.
3. With respect to CPT violation in the amplitudes, the parameters $(1 - \text{Re } A_I / \text{Re } \bar{A}_I)$ ($I = 0, 2$) associated with 2π decay mode also remain undertermined.

This is because from Eq.(39) these are given by

$$1 - \frac{\text{Re } \bar{A}_0}{\text{Re } A_0} = 2 (\text{Re } \epsilon - \text{Re } \epsilon_0 + \text{Re } \Delta),$$

$$1 - \frac{\text{Re } \bar{A}_2}{\text{Re } A_2} = \text{Re} \left(\frac{2\sqrt{2}\epsilon'}{\omega} e^{-i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \right) + \left(1 - \frac{\text{Re } \bar{A}_0}{\text{Re } A_0} \right),$$

and $\text{Re } \Delta$ is not determined.

4. However, as shown in Sec.IV, this lack of information can be improved by appealing to the observation of $\beta_l(t)$ and $\alpha_l(t)$ in the experiments which can provide K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$ beams separately. Then, as promised, 3 further CPT violating parameters $\text{Re } \Delta$, $\text{Re } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)$ and $(1 - \text{Re } \bar{A}_I / \text{Re } A_I)(I = 0, 2)$ can be determined.
5. Determination of the values of $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule violating parameters x and $\bar{x}_l$ requires the measurement of asymmetries of the kind that are order 1, in contrast to the previous ones which reduce to 0 in the exact symmetry limit. These asymmetries $\delta_l(t)$, $\bar{\delta}_l(t)$, $\gamma_l(t)$ and $\bar{\gamma}_l(t)$ have the common functional dependence on time t , denoted as Λ in Sec.IV. Λ consists of 8 parameters which are to be adjusted from the experiments.

In Table I, we have included the procedure for determining the CP and T violating parameters, $(\text{Im } A_I / \text{Re } A_I - \text{Im } \bar{A}_I / \text{Re } A_I)(I = 0, 2)$ in the 2π decay amplitudes, as possibly measured at a ϕ factory. This is true only if we *assume* that $\text{Im } \epsilon_0 = 0$ since $\text{Im } \epsilon_0$ as well as $\text{Im } y_l$ cannot appear in any observables in the experiments, so they cannot be measured in any way. In fact from Eq.(39) we then have

$$\frac{\text{Im } A_0}{\text{Re } A_0} - \frac{\text{Im } \bar{A}_0}{\text{Re } A_0} = 2 (\text{Im } \epsilon + \text{Im } \Delta), \quad (89)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{Im } A_2}{\text{Re } A_2} - \frac{\text{Im } \bar{A}_2}{\text{Re } A_2} = & \text{Im} \left(\frac{2\sqrt{2}\epsilon'}{\omega} e^{-i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \right) \\ & + \left(\frac{\text{Im } A_0}{\text{Re } A_0} - \frac{\text{Im } \bar{A}_0}{\text{Re } A_0} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

The fact that $\text{Im } \epsilon_0$ and $\text{Im } y_l$ does not appear in the measurable quantities in the experiments with separate K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$ beams has already been mentioned by Tanner and Dalitz [6]. We see that we are confronted with the same obstacle in the ϕ factory experiments. The reason is that they always appear accompanying 1 so that they drop out when we take

the absolute square of amplitudes to get probabilities to the first order with respect to small parameters [6]. If one persists to retain $\text{Im } \epsilon_0$, the combination

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\text{Im } A_0}{\text{Re } A_0} - \frac{\text{Im } \bar{A}_0}{\text{Re } A_0} \right) + \text{Im } \epsilon_0 = \text{Im } \epsilon + \text{Im } \Delta \quad (91)$$

is determined, but $(\text{Im } A_2/\text{Re } A_2 - \text{Im } \bar{A}_2/\text{Re } A_2)$ remains undetermined. To separate the $\text{Im } A_0/\text{Re } A_2 - \text{Im } \bar{A}_2/\text{Re } \bar{A}_2$ from $\text{Im } \epsilon_0$, we must appeal to the experiment that will reach to the order $\epsilon^2 \simeq 10^{-6}$ precision.

We refrain from making estimates of errors on various measurements as they depend too much on the actual experimental configurations. We, however, make a few comments along this line based on an elaborate work by Buchanan *et.al.* [8] with respect to a ϕ factory. They performed a quantitative analysis under the experimental situation at a ϕ factory. Considering the possibility of $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule violation, we can still apply their result with some modifications.

According to their results, $\delta_l(\infty)$ and $\bar{\delta}_l(\infty)$ is measured to the precision $\pm 0.013 \times 10^{-3}$ and $\pm 0.13 \times 10^{-3}$ respectively. From the relation

$$\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l = -\frac{1}{4} \left(\delta_l(\infty) - \bar{\delta}_l(\infty) \right), \quad (92)$$

we can determine $\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l$, not $\text{Re } \Delta$, within the error $\pm 0.032 \times 10^{-3}$. Also we have

$$\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l) = \frac{1}{4} \left(\delta_l(\infty) + \bar{\delta}_l(\infty) \right). \quad (93)$$

Hence we can obtain the value of $\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$ with the accuracy $\pm 0.032 \times 10^{-3}$. The observation of inclusive semileptonic decay channels gives $\text{Re } \epsilon_0$ to $\pm 0.18 \times 10^{-3}$ [8]. So, when combining this with the value of $\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$, CPT violating parameter in the semileptonic amplitude, $\text{Re } y_l$, will be determined to $\pm 0.19 \times 10^{-3}$. Inclusive semileptonic decay channel also gives $\text{Im } \Delta$ to $\pm 0.18 \times 10^{-3}$ [8]. The $\Delta t = (0 \sim 15)\tau_S$ behavior of $\mathcal{A}^{l+l-}(\Delta t)$ (see Eq.(77)) gives $\text{Im } \bar{\Delta}_l$. If $\text{Im } \bar{\Delta}_l$ can be measured with the precision $\pm 2.0 \times 10^{-3}$, the precision of $\text{Im } (x_l + \bar{x}_l)$ can reach the precision level $\pm 2.0 \times 10^{-3}$.

APPENDIX A:

This appendix is devoted to giving the expressions of the effective Hamiltonian which describes K mesons' time evolution. They are used in checking the transformation properties of various parameters in the neutral K meson system under discrete symmetries. Usual perturbative calculation in the second order with respect to the small perturbative part H_W yields [9]

$$\begin{aligned} M_{11} &= m_K + \langle K^0 | H_W | K^0 \rangle + \sum_n \mathbf{P} \frac{|\langle n | H_W | K^0 \rangle|^2}{m_K - m_n}, \\ M_{22} &= m_K + \langle \bar{K}^0 | H_W | \bar{K}^0 \rangle + \sum_n \mathbf{P} \frac{|\langle n | H_W | \bar{K}^0 \rangle|^2}{m_K - m_n}, \\ M_{12} &= \langle K^0 | H_W | \bar{K}^0 \rangle + \sum_n \mathbf{P} \frac{\langle K^0 | H_W | n \rangle \langle n | H_W | \bar{K}^0 \rangle}{m_K - m_n}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\mathbf{P}$ stands for taking the principal part, and m_n is the energy of the state $|n\rangle$ in the K meson rest frame. As for Γ'_{ij} s,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{11} &= 2\pi \sum_n \delta(m_K - m_n) \left| \langle n | H_W | K^0 \rangle \right|^2, \\ \Gamma_{22} &= 2\pi \sum_n \delta(m_K - m_n) \left| \langle n | H_W | \bar{K}^0 \rangle \right|^2, \\ \Gamma_{12} &= 2\pi \sum_n \delta(m_K - m_n) \langle K^0 | H_W | n \rangle \langle n | H_W | \bar{K}^0 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

With the use of the above expressions, we can verify in the physical phase convention that

- CPT conservation $\implies M_{11} = M_{22}$ and $\Gamma_{11} = \Gamma_{22}$
- CP conservation $\implies M_{11} = M_{22}, \Gamma_{11} = \Gamma_{22}, \text{Im } M_{12} = 0$ and $\text{Im } \Gamma_{12} = 0$
- T conservation $\implies \text{Im } M_{12} = 0$ and $\text{Im } \Gamma_{12} = 0$.

APPENDIX B:

In this appendix the expressions of ϵ and ϵ' in the Eq.(39) are derived with a few remarks. From Eqs.(9), (12) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle (2\pi)_I | T | K_L \rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(1+|\epsilon_2|^2)}} e^{i\delta_I} (p_2 A_I - q_2 \bar{A}_I), \\ \langle (2\pi)_I | T | K_S \rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(1+|\epsilon_1|^2)}} e^{i\delta_I} (p_1 A_I + q_1 \bar{A}_I).\end{aligned}$$

Using the relations between the charge eigenstates $|\pi^+\pi^-\rangle, |\pi^0\pi^0\rangle$ and isospin eigenstates $|(2\pi)_I\rangle$

$$\begin{aligned}|\pi^+\pi^-\rangle &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} |(2\pi)_2\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} |(2\pi)_0\rangle, \\ |\pi^0\pi^0\rangle &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} |(2\pi)_2\rangle - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} |(2\pi)_0\rangle,\end{aligned}\tag{B1}$$

one get

$$\langle \pi^+\pi^- | T | K_L \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} e^{i\delta_0} p_2 A_0 \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{q_2 \bar{A}_0}{p_2 A_0} \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \frac{p_2 A_2 - q_2 \bar{A}_2}{p_2 A_0} \right\},\tag{B2}$$

$$\langle \pi^0\pi^0 | T | K_L \rangle = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} e^{i\delta_0} p_2 A_0 \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{q_2 \bar{A}_0}{p_2 A_0} \right) - \sqrt{2} e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \frac{p_2 A_2 - q_2 \bar{A}_2}{p_2 A_0} \right\},$$

and by ignoring CP violation in K_S decay(it is sufficient since the denominators in $|\eta_{+-}|$ and $|\eta_{00}|$ are already order of CP, T or CPT violation parameters),

$$\langle \pi^+\pi^- | T | K_S \rangle = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} e^{i\delta_0} p_1 A_0 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \omega e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \right),\tag{B3}$$

$$\langle \pi^0\pi^0 | T | K_S \rangle = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} e^{i\delta_0} p_1 A_0 \left(1 - \sqrt{2} \omega e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \right).$$

Numerically $\omega \simeq \frac{1}{20}$. Thus neglecting terms of order ω^2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{+-} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{q_2 \bar{A}_0}{p_2 A_0} \right) - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \omega e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \left(1 - \frac{q_2 \bar{A}_0}{p_2 A_0} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \left(\frac{p_2 A_2 - q_2 \bar{A}_2}{p_2 A_0} \right), \\ \eta_{00} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{q_2 \bar{A}_0}{p_2 A_0} \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \omega e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \left(1 - \frac{q_2 \bar{A}_0}{p_2 A_0} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \left(\frac{p_2 A_2 - q_2 \bar{A}_2}{p_2 A_0} \right).\end{aligned}\tag{B4}$$

Expressing the above equations in terms of ϵ and ϵ' , one gets the results in Eq.(14)

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{q_2}{p_2} \frac{\bar{A}_0}{A_0} \right), \\ \epsilon' &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \left[-\omega \left(1 - \frac{q_2}{p_2} \right) + \left(\frac{p_2 A_2 - q_2 \bar{A}_2}{p_2 A_0} \right) \right].\end{aligned}\tag{B5}$$

Note that we have not assumed CPT symmetry in deriving the expressions for ϵ and ϵ' . ϵ measured in the K_L decay is sensitive only to ϵ_2 . This indicates the importance of measuring CP violating effects in the K_S decay. As noted in the Sec.II C, the relative phase between $CP|K^0\rangle$ and $|\bar{K}^0\rangle$ remains still unfixed. The Wu-Yang phase convention [11] is to fix the phase of $|K^0\rangle$ such that

$$\text{Im } A_0 = 0,\tag{B6}$$

with $CP|K^0\rangle = |\bar{K}^0\rangle$ and $CPT|K^0\rangle = |\bar{K}^0\rangle$. This convention is convenient only if CPT invariance is assumed, since then ϵ is exactly equal to ϵ_0 [9];

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon &= \epsilon_0, \\ \epsilon' &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \omega \frac{\text{Im } A_2}{\text{Re } A_2}.\end{aligned}\tag{B7}$$

This is the standard phase convention used by many authors in the context of CP violation. We find, however, it is more convenient to use the expressions defined in Eq.(B5), as there is no simplification by taking Wu-Yang convention.

APPENDIX C:

This appendix contains the expressions for $|A(f_1, t_1; f_2, t_2)|^2$ for $f_1, f_2 = \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi^+ \pi^-$ or $\pi^0 \pi^0$. They were obtained in Ref. [8] in the case that $x_l, \bar{x}_l = 0$. Each probability is the sum of three time dependence; $e^{-(\Gamma_L t_1 + \Gamma_S t_2)}$, $e^{-(\Gamma_S t_1 + \Gamma_L t_2)}$, and $e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}(t_1 + t_2)} \times \{\sin \text{ or } \cos\}$. Coefficients were calculated to the first order with respect to small parameters like ϵ_0 . Exceptional case is the one in which such an approximation gives 0 for the value of some coefficient. Then the second order contribution to it was calculated.

$$|A(\pi\pi, t_1; \pi\pi, t_2)|^2 = \frac{1}{2} |\langle \pi\pi | T | K_S \rangle|^2 |\langle \pi\pi | T | K_L \rangle|^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \times \left[e^{-(\Gamma_L t_1 + \Gamma_S t_2)} + e^{-(\Gamma_S t_1 + \Gamma_L t_2)} \right. \\ & \left. - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}(t_1 + t_2)} \cos(\Delta m(t_1 - t_2)) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (C1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| A(\pi^+ \pi^-, t_1; \pi^0 \pi^0, t_2) \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left| \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | T | K_S \rangle \right|^2 \left| \langle \pi^0 \pi^0 | T | K_S \rangle \right|^2 \\ & \times \left[|\eta_{\pi^+ \pi^-}|^2 e^{-(\Gamma_L t_1 + \Gamma_S t_2)} + |\eta_{\pi^0 \pi^0}|^2 e^{-(\Gamma_S t_1 + \Gamma_L t_2)} \right. \\ & \left. - 2 |\eta_{\pi^+ \pi^-}| |\eta_{\pi^0 \pi^0}| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}(t_1 + t_2)} \cos(\Delta m(t_1 - t_2) - \phi_{\pi^+ \pi^-} + \phi_{\pi^0 \pi^0}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (C2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| A(\pi^- l^+ \nu_l, t_1; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, t_2) \right|^2 \\ &= 2 \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^4 \left[(1 + 4\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l) e^{-(\Gamma_S t_1 + \Gamma_L t_2)} + (1 - 4\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l) e^{-(\Gamma_L t_1 + \Gamma_S t_2)} \right. \\ & \left. + 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}(t_1 + t_2)} \left\{ \cos(\Delta m(t_1 - t_2)) - 4\text{Im } \bar{\Delta}_l \sin(\Delta m(t_1 - t_2)) \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (C3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| A(\pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, t_1; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, t_2) \right|^2 \\ &= 2 \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^4 (1 - 4\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y)) \left[e^{-(\Gamma_S t_1 + \Gamma_L t_2)} + e^{-(\Gamma_L t_1 + \Gamma_S t_2)} \right. \\ & \left. - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}(t_1 + t_2)} \cos(\Delta m(t_1 - t_2)) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (C4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| A(\pi^- l^+ \nu_l, t_1; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, t_2) \right|^2 \\ &= 2 \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^4 (1 + 4\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y)) \left[e^{-(\Gamma_S t_1 + \Gamma_L t_2)} + e^{-(\Gamma_L t_1 + \Gamma_S t_2)} \right. \\ & \left. - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}(t_1 + t_2)} \cos(\Delta m(t_1 - t_2)) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (C5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| A(\pi^- l^+ \nu_l, t_1; \pi \pi, t_2) \right|^2 \\ &= \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 |\langle \pi \pi | T | K_S \rangle|^2 \left[|\eta_{\pi \pi}|^2 e^{-(\Gamma_S t_1 + \Gamma_L t_2)} \right. \\ & + (1 + 2\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l) - 2\text{Re } (\Delta + x_l)) e^{-(\Gamma_L t_1 + \Gamma_S t_2)} \\ & \left. - 2 |\eta_{\pi \pi}| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}(t_1 + t_2)} \cos(\Delta m(t_1 - t_2) + \phi_{\pi \pi}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (C6)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| A(\pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, t_1; \pi\pi, t_2) \right|^2 \\
&= \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 |\langle \pi\pi | T | K_S \rangle|^2 \left[|\eta_{\pi\pi}|^2 e^{-(\Gamma_S t_1 + \Gamma_L t_2)} \right. \\
&+ (1 - 2\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) + 2\text{Re}(\Delta - \bar{x}_l)) e^{-(\Gamma_L t_1 + \Gamma_S t_2)} \\
&\left. + 2|\eta_{\pi\pi}| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}(t_1 + t_2)} \cos(\Delta m(t_1 - t_2) + \phi_{\pi\pi}) \right], \tag{C7}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|A(\pi\pi, t)|^2 &\equiv \sum_f \int_0^\infty dt' |A(\pi\pi, t; f, t')|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} |\langle \pi\pi | T | K_S \rangle|^2 \left\{ |\eta_{\pi\pi}|^2 e^{-\Gamma_L t} + e^{-\Gamma_S t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2|\eta_{\pi\pi}| |\langle K_S | K_L \rangle| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta m t - \phi_{\pi\pi} - \phi_{LS}) \right\}, \tag{C8}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|A(\pi^- l^+ \nu_l, t)|^2 &\equiv \sum_f \int_0^\infty dt' |A(\pi^- l^+ \nu, t; f, t')|^2 \\
&= \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 \left[\{1 + 2[\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \text{Re}(\Delta + x_l)]\} e^{-\Gamma_L t} \right. \\
&\quad + \{1 + 2[\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) + \text{Re}(\Delta + x_l)]\} e^{-\Gamma_S t} \\
&\quad \left. - 2|\langle K_S | K_L \rangle| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta m t - \phi_{LS}) \right], \tag{C9}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|A(\pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, t)|^2 &\equiv \sum_f \int_0^\infty dt' |A(\pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}, t; f, t')|^2 \\
&= \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 \left[\{1 - 2[\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \text{Re}(\Delta - \bar{x}_l)]\} e^{-\Gamma_L t} \right. \\
&\quad + \{1 - 2[\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) + \text{Re}(\Delta - \bar{x}_l)]\} e^{-\Gamma_S t} \\
&\quad \left. + 2|\langle K_S | K_L \rangle| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t} \cos(\Delta m t - \phi_{LS}) \right]. \tag{C10}
\end{aligned}$$

They may become useful when more practical experimental situation is considered, for example, the fiducial volume effect, finiteness in the vertex resolution ability, or experimental cut for small $|\Delta t|$ value, or when the experiments do not concentrate on the use of $|A(\Delta t; f_1, f_2)|^2$.

APPENDIX D:

In this appendix we summarize various relative time probability distribution functions which appear at a ϕ factory. The results are the same in Ref. [8] for the purely hadronic

decay mode:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |A(\Delta t; \pi\pi, \pi\pi)|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2\Gamma} |\langle \pi\pi | T | K_S \rangle \langle \pi\pi | T | K_L \rangle|^2 \{e^{-\Gamma_L |\Delta t|} + e^{-\Gamma_S |\Delta t|} \\
&\quad - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} |\Delta t|} \cos(\Delta m |\Delta t|)\}, \tag{D1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& |A(\Delta t > 0; \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^0\pi^0)|^2 \\
&= \frac{|\epsilon|^2}{2\Gamma} |\langle \pi^+\pi^- | T | K_S \rangle \langle \pi^0\pi^0 | T | K_S \rangle|^2 \\
&\quad \left[(1 + 2\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon))e^{-\Gamma_L \Delta t} + (1 - 4\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon))e^{-\Gamma_S \Delta t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} \Delta t} \{(1 - \text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon)) \cos(\Delta m \Delta t) + 3\text{Im}(\epsilon'/\epsilon) \sin(\Delta m \Delta t)\} \right], \tag{D2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& |A(\Delta t < 0; \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^0\pi^0)|^2 \\
&= \frac{|\epsilon|^2}{2\Gamma} |\langle \pi^+\pi^- | T | K_S \rangle \langle \pi^0\pi^0 | T | K_S \rangle|^2 \\
&\quad \left[(1 - 4\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon))e^{-\Gamma_L |\Delta t|} + (1 + 2\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon))e^{-\Gamma_S |\Delta t|} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} |\Delta t|} \{(1 - \text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon)) \cos(\Delta m |\Delta t|) - 3\text{Im}(\epsilon'/\epsilon) \sin(\Delta m |\Delta t|)\} \right]. \tag{D3}
\end{aligned}$$

When at least one of two channels is semileptonic one, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |A(\Delta t > 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2 \\
&= \frac{2}{\Gamma} \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^4 \left[(1 - 4\text{Re}(\bar{\Delta}_l))e^{-\Gamma_L \Delta t} + (1 + 4\text{Re}(\bar{\Delta}_l))e^{-\Gamma_S \Delta t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} \Delta t} \{\cos(\Delta m \Delta t) - 4\text{Im}(\bar{\Delta}_l) \sin(\Delta m \Delta t)\} \right], \tag{D4}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& |A(\Delta t < 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2 \\
&= \frac{2}{\Gamma} \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^4 \left[(1 + 4\text{Re}(\bar{\Delta}_l))e^{-\Gamma_L |\Delta t|} + (1 - 4\text{Re}(\bar{\Delta}_l))e^{-\Gamma_S |\Delta t|} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} |\Delta t|} \{\cos(\Delta m |\Delta t|) + 4\text{Im}(\bar{\Delta}_l) \sin(\Delta m |\Delta t|)\} \right], \tag{D5}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& |A(\Delta t; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l)|^2 \\
&= \frac{2}{\Gamma} \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^4 (1 - 4\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l)) \{e^{-\Gamma_L |\Delta t|} + e^{-\Gamma_S |\Delta t|} \\
&\quad - 2e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} |\Delta t|} \cos(\Delta m |\Delta t|)\}, \tag{D6}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| A(\Delta t; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi^- l^+ \nu_l) \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{2}{F} \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^4 (1 + 4 \operatorname{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l)) \left\{ e^{-\Gamma_L |\Delta t|} + e^{-\Gamma_S |\Delta t|} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} |\Delta t|} \cos(\Delta m |\Delta t|) \right\}, \tag{D7}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| A(\Delta t > 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi \pi) \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{F} \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 |\langle \pi \pi | T | K_S \rangle|^2 \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \left[1 + 2 [\operatorname{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \operatorname{Re}(\Delta + x_l)] \right] e^{-\Gamma_L \Delta t} + |\eta_{\pi\pi}|^2 e^{-\Gamma_S \Delta t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 |\eta_{\pi\pi}| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} \Delta t} \cos(\Delta m \Delta t + \phi_{\pi\pi}) \right\}, \tag{D8}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| A(\Delta t < 0; \pi^- l^+ \nu_l, \pi \pi) \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{F} \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 |\langle \pi \pi | T | K_S \rangle|^2 \\
&\quad \times \left\{ |\eta_{\pi\pi}|^2 e^{-\Gamma_L |\Delta t|} + \left[1 + 2 [\operatorname{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \operatorname{Re}(\Delta + x_l)] \right] e^{-\Gamma_S |\Delta t|} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 |\eta_{\pi\pi}| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} |\Delta t|} \cos(\Delta m |\Delta t| - \phi_{\pi\pi}) \right\}, \tag{D9}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| A(\Delta t > 0; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi \pi) \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{F} \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 |\langle \pi \pi | T | K_S \rangle|^2 \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \left[1 - 2 [\operatorname{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \operatorname{Re}(\Delta - \bar{x}_l)] \right] e^{-\Gamma_L \Delta t} + |\eta_{\pi\pi}|^2 e^{-\Gamma_S \Delta t} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2 |\eta_{\pi\pi}| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} \Delta t} \cos(\Delta m \Delta t + \phi_{\pi\pi}) \right\}, \tag{D10}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| A(\Delta t < 0; \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l, \pi \pi) \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{F} \left| \frac{F_l}{2} \right|^2 |\langle \pi \pi | T | K_S \rangle|^2 \\
&\quad \times \left\{ |\eta_{\pi\pi}|^2 e^{-\Gamma_L |\Delta t|} + \left[1 - 2 [\operatorname{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \operatorname{Re}(\Delta - \bar{x}_l)] \right] e^{-\Gamma_S |\Delta t|} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2 |\eta_{\pi\pi}| e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2} |\Delta t|} \cos(\Delta m |\Delta t| - \phi_{\pi\pi}) \right\}. \tag{D11}
\end{aligned}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] Plans to build the ϕ factory are also being studied at KEK [15] and UCLA (see the proceeding cited in [16]).
- [2] C.O.Dib and B.Guberina, Phys.Lett.**255B**,113(1990);
P.Heiliger and L.M.Sehgal, Phys.Lett.**265B**,410(1991).
- [3] Review of Particle Properties, K.Hikasa *et al.*, Phys.Rev.**D45**,1(1992).
- [4] G.Lüders, Ann.Phys.**2**,1(1957) and references therein.
- [5] M.Kobayashi and A.I.Sanda, Phys.Rev.Lett.**69**,3139(1992).
- [6] N.W.Tanner and R.H.Dalitz, Ann.Phys.(N.Y.)**171**,463(1986).
- [7] I.Dunietz, J.Hauser and J.L.Rosner, Phys.Rev.**D35**,2166(1987).
- [8] C.D.Buchanan, R.Cousins, C.Dib, R.D.Peccei and J.Quackenbush, Phys.Rev. **D45**, 4088(1992).
- [9] T.D.Lee and C.S.Wu, Ann.Rev.Nucl.Sci.**16**,511(1966).
- [10] M.Gell-Mann and A.Pais, Phys.Rev.**97**, 1387(1955).
- [11] T.T.Wu and C.N.Yang, Phys.Rev.Lett.**13**,380(1964).
- [12] L.Lavoura, Mod.Phys.Lett.**A7**,1367(1992).
- [13] R.Carosi *et al.*, Phys.Lett.**237B**,303(1990).
- [14] See, for example, O.Frackler, D.Frisch, J.Martin, G.Smoot and L.Sompayrac, Phys.Rev.Lett.**31**,847(1973);
J.C.Hart *et al.*, Nucl.Phys.**B66**, 317(1973).
- [15] M.Fukawa *et al.*, KEK Report No.90-12,1990.
- [16] For the LEAR experiments, see R.Adler *et al.*, in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Test-*

ing CPT and Studying CP Violation at a ϕ Factory, edited by D.B.Cline(Nucl.Phys.B(Proc.Suppl.) **24A**(1991)).

[17] In preparing this paper, the same result was obtained in V.Patera and A.Pugliese, LNF-92/056(P).

[18] P.K.Kabir, Phys.Rev.**D2**,540(1970).

TABLES

TABLE I. The measurement of parameters at a ϕ factory. The Eq.number in the right of each quantity shows that appearing in the text. The Δt or t region indicates that of the quantity which is sensitive to the parameter we want. $\delta_l(\infty)$ and $\bar{\delta}_l(\infty)$ are $\delta_l(\infty) = 2(\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \text{Re} \bar{\Delta}_l)$ and $\bar{\delta}_l(\infty) = 2(\text{Re}(\epsilon_0 - y_l) + \text{Re} \bar{\Delta}_l)$ respectively. We complete this table by the addition of the results obtained in Ref. [8]

parameter	quantity	Eq.number	Δt or t region
Γ_S	$ A(\pi^+\pi^-, t) ^2$	Eq.(79)	$t = (0 \sim 15)\tau_S$
Γ_L	$A(\pi^-l^+\nu_l, t)$	Eq.(C9)	$t \gg \tau_S$
	$A(\pi^+l^-\bar{\nu}_l, t)$	Eq.(C10)	$t \gg \tau_S$
Δm	$A(\Delta t; \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^+\pi^-)$	Eq.(D1)	$\Delta t = (0 \sim 10)\tau_S$
ϕ_{SW}	From $\text{Arctan}(2\Delta m/(\Gamma_S - \Gamma_L))$		
$ \eta_{+-} $	$ A(\pi^+\pi^-, t) ^2$	Eq.(79)	$t \gg \tau_S$
$ \eta_{00} $	$ A(\pi^0\pi^0, t) ^2$	Eq.(79)	$t \gg \tau_S$
ϕ_{+-}	$\mathcal{A}_{\pi^+\pi^-, l^+l^-}^-$	Eq.(73)	
	$\mathcal{A}^{\pi^+\pi^-}(\Delta t < 0; \pi^-l^+\nu_l, \pi^+l^-\bar{\nu}_l)$	Eq.(83)	$ \Delta t = (0 \sim 15)\tau_S$
Re (ϵ'/ϵ)	$\mathcal{A}^{\pi^+\pi^-, \pi^0\pi^0}$	Eq. (67)	
	$\mathcal{A}(\Delta t; \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^0\pi^0)$	Eq. (78)	$\Delta t \gg 20\tau_S$
	double ratio R		
Im (ϵ'/ϵ)	$\mathcal{A}(\Delta t; \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^0\pi^0)$	Eq.(78)	$\Delta t = (0 \sim 15)\tau_S$
$(\phi_{+-} - \phi_{00})$	From $3\text{Im}(\epsilon'/\epsilon)$		
ϵ	From $\frac{1}{3}(\eta_{+-} + 2\eta_{00})$		
(Table I continued)			
$\delta_l(\infty)$	$\mathcal{A}^{\pi\pi}(\Delta t > 0; \pi^-l^+\nu_l, \pi^+l^-\bar{\nu}_l)$	Eq. (82)	$\Delta t \gg \tau_S$
	$\mathcal{A}_{\pi\pi, l^+l^-}^+$	Eq. (71)	
	$\mathcal{A}_{l^+l^-}^{\text{inclusive}}(t)$	Eq. (84)	$t \gg \tau_S$
	$\mathcal{A}_{l^+l^-}^{\text{inclusive}}$	Eq. (74)	
$\bar{\delta}_l(\infty)$	Measurement of K_S decay		
	with K_L tagging		
Re $\bar{\Delta}_l$	$\mathcal{A}^{l^+l^-}(\Delta t)$	Eq. (77)	$\Delta t \gg \tau_S$
	$\mathcal{A}_{l^+l^-}$	Eq. (68)	
	From $-\frac{1}{4}(\delta_l(\infty) - \bar{\delta}_l(\infty))$		
Im $\bar{\Delta}_l$	$\mathcal{A}^{l^+l^-}(\Delta t)$	Eq. (77)	$\Delta t = (0 \sim 15)\tau_S$
Re ($\epsilon_0 - y_l$)	$\mathcal{A}(\Delta t; \pi^+l^-\bar{\nu}_l, \pi^-l^+\nu_l)$	Eq. (81)	
	$\mathcal{A}(\pi^+l^-\bar{\nu}_l, \pi^-l^+\nu_l)^{37}$	Eq. (70)	
	From $\frac{1}{4}(\delta_l(\infty) + \bar{\delta}_l(\infty))$		

TABLE II. The coefficients $A - D$ in the time dependent asymmetries $\beta_l(t)$ (Eq.(85)) and $\alpha_l(t)$ (Eq.(86)).

	A	B	C	D
α_l	$2\text{Re } y_l + 4\text{Re } \Delta$	$2\text{Re } y_l - 4\text{Re } \Delta$	$4\text{Re } y_l$	$8\text{Im } \Delta$
	$+\text{Re } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)$	$-\text{Re } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)$		$+2\text{Im } (x_l + \bar{x}_l)$
β_l	$4\text{Re } \epsilon_0 - 2\text{Re } y_l$	$4\text{Re } \epsilon_0 - 2\text{Re } y_l$	$-4[2\text{Re } \epsilon_0 - \text{Re } y_l]$	$2\text{Im } (x_l + \bar{x}_l)$
	$-\text{Re } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)$	$+\text{Re } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)$		

TABLE III. The determination of the values of parameters from $\beta_l(t)$ and $\alpha_l(t)$ in the experiments with kaon tagging. The symbol($\alpha_l(t), A$) in the second column, for example, shows that the parameter can be determined from the measurement of the coefficient A in the asymmetry α_l . Then the value of the parameter is given by the calculation as shown in the third column.

parameter	measurement	calculation
$\text{Re } \Delta$	$(\alpha_l(t), A)$	$\frac{1}{2} [(\alpha_l(t), A) - 2\text{Re } y_l - 2\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l]$
$\text{Re } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)$	$(\beta_l(t), A)$	$2\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l - 2\text{Re } \Delta$
		$\frac{1}{2} [-(\beta_l(t), A) + 4\text{Re } \epsilon_0 - 2\text{Re } y_l]$
$\left(1 - \frac{\text{Re } \bar{A}_0}{\text{Re } A_0}\right)$		From $2\text{Re } (\epsilon - (\epsilon_0 - \Delta))$
$\left(1 - \frac{\text{Re } \bar{A}_2}{\text{Re } A_2}\right)$		$\text{Re } \left(\frac{2\sqrt{2}\epsilon'}{\omega} e^{-i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \right) + \left(1 - \frac{\text{Re } \bar{A}_0}{\text{Re } A_0}\right)$

TABLE IV. The coefficients $A - H$ in the time dependent asymmetries, functional form of which is of the type Λ (see Eq.(88)).

	A	B	C	D
δ_l	$\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$ $-\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l$	$\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$ $+\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l$	$1 - 2\text{Re } \epsilon_0$	$-2\text{Im } \Delta$ $-\text{Im } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)$
$\bar{\delta}_l$	$\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$ $-\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l$	$\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$ $+\text{Re } \bar{\Delta}_l$	$-1 - 2\text{Re } \epsilon_0$	$-2\text{Im } \Delta$ $+\text{Im } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)$
γ_l	$\text{Re } \epsilon_0 + \text{Re } \Delta$	$\text{Re } \epsilon_0 - \text{Re } \Delta$	$-1 - 2\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$	$2(\text{Im } \Delta + \text{Im } x_l)$
$\bar{\gamma}_l$	$\text{Re } \epsilon_0 + \text{Re } \Delta$	$\text{Re } \epsilon_0 - \text{Re } \Delta$	$1 - 2\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$	$2(\text{Im } \Delta + \text{Im } \bar{x}_l)$
	E	F	G	H
δ_l	$2\text{Re } \Delta + \text{Re } x_l$ $+\text{Re } \bar{x}_l + 2\text{Re } \epsilon_0$	$-[2\text{Re } \Delta + \text{Re } x_l$ $+\text{Re } \bar{x}_l] + 2\text{Re } \epsilon_0$	$-4\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$	$4\text{Im } \Delta$ $+2\text{Im } (x_l + \bar{x}_l)$
$\bar{\delta}_l$	$2\text{Re } \Delta - \text{Re } x_l$ $-\text{Re } \bar{x}_l + 2\text{Re } \epsilon_0$	$-[2\text{Re } \Delta - \text{Re } x_l$ $-\text{Re } \bar{x}_l] + 2\text{Re } \epsilon_0$	$-4\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$	$4\text{Im } \Delta$ $+2\text{Im } (x_l + \bar{x}_l)$
γ_l	$2[\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$ $-\text{Re } \Delta - \text{Re } x_l]$	$2[\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$ $+\text{Re } \Delta + \text{Re } x_l]$	$-4\text{Re } \epsilon_0$	$-4\text{Im } \Delta$
$\bar{\gamma}_l$	$2[\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$ $-\text{Re } \Delta + \text{Re } \bar{x}_l]$	$2[\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l)$ $+\text{Re } \Delta - \text{Re } \bar{x}_l]$	$-4\text{Re } \epsilon_0$	$-4\text{Im } \Delta$

TABLE V. The determination of the values of parameters from $\delta_l(t), \bar{\delta}_l(t), \gamma_l(t)$ and $\bar{\gamma}_l(t)$ in the kaon tagging experiments. The meaning of (δ_l, E) , for example, is the same as in Table III.

parameter	measurement	calculation
$\text{Im } x_l + \text{Im } \bar{x}_l$		$2\text{Im } \bar{\Delta}_l - 2\text{Im } \Delta$
$\text{Re } (x_l + \bar{x}_l)$	$(\delta_l(t), E)$	$(\delta_l(t), E) - 2\text{Re } \Delta - 2\text{Re } \epsilon_0$
	$(\bar{\delta}_l(t), E)$	$2\text{Re } \Delta + 2\text{Re } \epsilon_0 - (\bar{\delta}_l(t), E)$
$\text{Re } x_l$		$\frac{1}{2} [\text{Re } (x_l + \bar{x}_l) + \text{Re } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)]$
	$(\gamma_l(t), E)$	$\text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l) - \text{Re } \Delta - (\gamma_l(t), E)$
$\text{Re } \bar{x}_l$		$\frac{1}{2} [\text{Re } (x_l + \bar{x}_l) - \text{Re } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)]$
	$(\bar{\gamma}_l(t), E)$	$(\bar{\gamma}_l(t), E) - \text{Re } (\epsilon_0 - y_l) + \text{Re } \Delta$
$\text{Im } x_l - \text{Im } \bar{x}_l$	$(\delta_l(t), D)$	$-2\text{Im } \Delta - (\delta_l(t), D)$
	$(\bar{\delta}_l(t), D)$	$2\text{Im } \Delta + (\bar{\delta}_l(t), D)$
$\text{Im } x_l$		$\frac{1}{2} [\text{Im } (x_l + \bar{x}_l) + \text{Im } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)]$
	$(\gamma_l(t), D)$	$(\gamma_l(t), D) - \text{Im } \Delta$
$\text{Im } \bar{x}_l$		$\frac{1}{2} [\text{Im } (x_l + \bar{x}_l) - \text{Im } (x_l - \bar{x}_l)]$
	$(\bar{\gamma}_l(t), D)$	$(\bar{\gamma}_l(t), D) - \text{Im } \Delta$